

Appl. No. 10/687,180  
Amdt dated December 1, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
DEC 01 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-42 are pending. Claims 7-14, 21-28 and 35-42 are allowed.

Claims 1, 7, 15, 29, 30, 32, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 42 have been amended to comply with the current practice of using the phrase "previously presented" rather than "previously amended."

The objection of claim 11 is obviated by applicant's amendment, as suggested by the Examiner, which replaces "an" with "a" sensor.

Claims 1, 15 and 29 have been amended to a "method for obtaining a 3D volumetric image of an object in which a ray of energy from a source travels through the object to directly impinge on an energy sensor..." Support for this amendment can be found in Fig. 2 of the specification.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 15-17, 29-31, and 33 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirano (JP 02-205760) in view of McCroskey (US Patent 5138642) is respectively traversed. Without conceding anything about the rejection of the dependent claims, the basis for the rejections of independent claims 1, 15 and 29 is fundamentally flawed because the combination of Hirano and McCroskey do not show each and every limitation of applicant's amended claims.

Applicant's amended claims 1, 15, and 29 call for a "method for obtaining a 3D volumetric image of an object in which a ray of energy from a source travels through the object to directly impinge on an energy sensor..." However, Hirano shows x-ray passing through a body whereupon certain wavelengths are first reflected by spectroscopes 3 and/or 5 prior to impinging upon detectors 4, 6, and 7 (see Hirano's Fig. 1). Similarly, McCroskey, rather than showing light from the object directly impinging on an energy screen, shows light passing through the object being first reflected from a scintillation screen 42 and then passing through a series of lens 43 prior to impacting CCD chips.

The remaining rejections all depend on Hirano teaching what it doesn't teach, and none of the citations teach the claim limitation of applicant's independent claims 1, 15 and 29. Therefore, these rejections should also be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/687,180  
Amdt dated December 1, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

The Examiner is thanked for allowing claims 7-14, 21-28, and 35-42. In view of the foregoing, applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance and respectively solicits a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-3881.

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



By  
Robert Berliner  
Registration No.: 20,121  
BERLINER & ASSOCIATES  
555 West Fifth Street, 31st Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90013

(213) 533-4171 (Telephone)  
(213) 533-4174 (Fax)